

Polk County Public Schools

Southwest Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/swe>

Demographics

Principal: Julie Sloan

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: C (44%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Southwest Elementary School

2650 SOUTHWEST AVE, Lakeland, FL 33803

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/swe>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	C	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Southwest Elementary will nurture academic excellence and integrity by promoting a passion for learning in a safe environment while providing a high quality education for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

S.A.I.L. Students Active In Learning

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
sloan, julie	Principal	
Cayer, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Lawton, Kyle	Instructional Technology	
Beardsley, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	
Looney, Laquita	School Counselor	
Draper, Brady	Assistant Principal	
Runnels, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	62	68	64	70	76	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	6	2	3	1	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	3	3	3	6	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	38	24	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

23

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/19/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	64	62	71	74	62	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	393
One or more suspensions	3	4	9	4	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	30	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	51%	57%	48%	51%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	43%	51%	58%	51%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	49%	53%	41%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	57%	63%	69%	58%	61%
Math Learning Gains	83%	56%	62%	80%	57%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	47%	51%	69%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	61%	47%	53%	47%	46%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	62 (0)	68 (0)	64 (0)	70 (0)	76 (0)	60 (0)	400 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	6 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	20 (0)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	36 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	38 (0)	24 (0)	40 (0)	102 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	52%	-1%	58%	-7%
	2018	39%	51%	-12%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	48%	-1%	58%	-11%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	38%	47%	-9%	56%	-18%
	2018	40%	50%	-10%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	52%	56%	-4%	62%	-10%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	62%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	56%	18%	64%	10%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		30%				
05	2019	61%	51%	10%	60%	1%
	2018	73%	56%	17%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	53%	45%	8%	53%	0%
	2018	47%	51%	-4%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	36	36	55	42	74		38				
ELL	50	37		67	70	50					
BLK	30	30		48	77		43				
HSP	48	38		72	82	50	73				
WHT	65	53	46	73	89	75	68				
FRL	41	38	39	56	78	65	57				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	17	31	27	30	50	30					
ELL	40	50		53	75						
BLK	29	34	50	50	63		50				
HSP	41	41		48	77	50	46				
WHT	60	55		76	77	60	59				
FRL	43	43	33	58	72	57	55				

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	7	8	31	50	42	20				
ELL	21	27		74	88		50				
BLK	38	41	30	60	79	90	27				
HSP	42	47		76	77		48				
WHT	57	61		69	79	62	50				
FRL	44	48	41	72	83	85	37				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	451
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data performance scoring the lowest on 2019 FSA was ELA learning gains for the bottom 25%, scoring only 40% proficient. This has been an ongoing trend for the school and is attributed to lack of services from inclusion teacher due to absences and a need for more small group interventions.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

the subgroup showing the greatest decline was percent proficient on FSA ELA was the ELL group dropping from 50% down to 40%. The decline is attributed to a rise in the number of students in this category moving from other countries and being non english speaking

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Fifth grade FSA ELA shows the greatest gap in scores compared to the state averages. This is an ongoing trend and lack of support and small group instruction is a factor.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The area showing the most improvement is third grade FSA ELA rising from 39% to 51% proficient. Also notably higher were the Fourth grade FSA MATH percent proficient rising from 56% to 74%

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

One area of concern is the amount of students falling below the 90% attendance rate. Another area of concern is the disproportionate number of office referrals in regards to black students compared to other races.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase the proficiency of the ELL subgroups in all academic areas
2. Increase the proficiency and learning gains of the bottom 25% in ELA
3. decrease the amount of absences
4. decrease the amount of discipline referrals and OSS of black students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Supportive Environment Data
Rationale	When analyzing supportive environment data such as, attendance, discipline etc, it is evident that additional supports must be utilized in order to improve relationships.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To reduce the gap between African American students and other subgroups for discipline referrals. Reduce the amount of tardies and absences for all students
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS system, Champs, Sanford Harmony and mentors
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	There will be 100% Teacher participation in supporting the PBS Plan with fidelity with 80% or higher of students reaching the PBS Goal including 100% completion of all MTSS Checklists. Leadership team will monitor attendance and the Early Warning System to communicate the importance of attendance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Actions and steps to be taken to reach the stated goal are to incorporate and follow through with CHAMPS, PBS System, 2. Check in Check out, 3. assign mentors, 4. seamlessly incorporate the MTSS Checklist & Process. 5. Monitor and use the Early Warning System and have consistent communication with parents and social workers discussing attendance. 6. Staff will effectively implement the Sanford harmony Program
Person Responsible	Brady Draper (brady.draper@polk-fl.net)

#2	
Title	Learning environment
Rationale	collaboratively planning lessons and tasks to meet the full intent of the standards. Incorporating a seamless MTSS process focusing on small group instruction
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	When teachers align Learning Targets and task complexity, work collaboratively, allow for release of learning to students, then student achievement will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	collaborative planning with Reading Coach small group reading instruction delivered by reading interventionist with researched based materials and strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	To teach and have students show evidence of the full depth of standard, utilize small group instruction Expected % of proficiency for ELA to rise from 51% to 56 % Learning Gains 40% to 48 % Lowest 25% from 32% to 40%
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Make use of Instructional coaches in collaborative planning and resources with modeling in the classroom. Teachers will plan using curriculum maps and modules while providing small group instruction. teachers will have weekly common planning with the literacy coach as well as two curriculum planning days during the school year 2. Teachers will use District Progress Monitoring Data in UNIFY to lead instruction. 3. Title 1 paras will be used to provide math and reading interventions in small groups within the classroom setting. 4. News ELA, Scholastic and other resources will be utilized to provide the instruction via direct instruction and the use of IPADS 5. The school will also offer extended learning opportunities by providing after school tutoring for students in grades 3-5 for both reading and math. 6. Small group instruction will be provided by the Reading Interventionist
Person Responsible	julie sloan (julie.sloan@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

The remaining school wide focus areas will be addressed through mentoring, tutoring and supplies all provided by volunteers. Additional mental health support will be provided through the threat assessment team and the behavior analyst. The school social worker will provide support with attendance and mental health cases.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

See Title One Parent Involvement Plan which includes numerous Family Nights such as Science Night, Camp Read a lot, Math Game Night, Movie Night, Title I parent Night/Open House, Parent Conference Night, PTO events, After School Tutoring, Book Fair and fundraising events. The school plans to use these vents to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students. Please see attached Parent and Family Engagement Plan for full details on how we plan to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Southwest Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students through the implementation of our PBS and CHAMPS programs. Our guidance counselor will oversee this program with the support of the school-based leadership team, MTSS Committee, and all staff members. We also have a district assigned school psychologist, social worker, mental health counselor, as well as other "as needed" district staff who can help with students with temporary or crisis level needs. Students will also be served by community and staff mentors. Students identified as having social-emotional needs are given the opportunity to meet with the guidance counselor individually or in small groups or if applicable can be met through the classroom staff on a one-to-one basis. Severe cases may be handled with a contracted mental health counselor. The IEP also identifies and addresses social emotional goals for all of our students. Our school also utilizes the following resources (not all will apply and please elaborate on applicable resources):

- Champs
- PBIS
- Mentoring Programs

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The administrative team monitors Southwest's kindergarten transition activities. Kindergarten Round-Up is held each year with kindergarten teachers playing an important role in the process by providing exciting activities for participants. An invitational atmosphere is created for both students and parents. During the Round-Up, parents are given information about our kindergarten curriculum, routine and available staff support. When appropriate, referrals are made for readiness programs such as Head Start. Local community Pre K programs are notified in advance and fliers are given out to encourage participation. Our school's operating budget and Title I funds are used to supply materials for our kindergarten transition program. FLKRS is used in kindergarten to assess student needs. Observation and reading readiness assessments are administered by the teachers to determine skill levels and establish learning starting points. The guidance counselor is available, as needed, to observe behaviors and assess student behavioral patterns. 5th graders visiting/touring middle schools WE3 Expo

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

- Title I, Part A project funds school-wide services at our eligible and participating Title I schools. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions so that all students achieve academic success.
- Title I, Part C project funds assist students that are prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status, as defined by federal and state regulations.
- Title I, Part D project funds provide Transition Facilitators at select Neglected and Delinquent school sites to assist students who transition from Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) facilities back into their zoned school.
- Title II funds provide professional development resources to build the capacity of teachers by funding consultants, district professional development personnel, including district/regional coaches, and curriculum specialists. The Title II project contributes to the recruitment/retention of teachers in the district by funding district recruitment personnel, recruitment initiatives both within and outside the school district.
- Title III provides supplemental resources for English Language Learners (ELL) and their teachers in Title I schools, professional learning opportunities for school staff, as well as parent family engagement opportunities.
- Title IX – Homeless OR HEARTH Program funded through Title IX and Title I, provides support for students identified as being in a homeless situation. Title I provides support for this program, through funding of HEARTH staff, professional development, and contracted extended learning services for students.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

SWE has established a partnership with Lakeland Police Department , Tenoroc Power Academy, Florida Fish & Wildlife, and Lakeland Fire Department. Each of these partners have made visits to our school to share specifics of the ir job and duties. They provided resources and information on requirements to work in these careers. Leadership Team members also share college and career readiness paths and requirements to become education experts.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Supportive Environment Data	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Learning environment	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00